

Serial No. 09/684,490

PATENT
Docket No. 78700.010000**REMARKS**

In this response, no claims have been added or canceled. Claims 10, 11, 16, 18-21, 68 and 75 have been previously canceled. Thus, independent claims 1 and 76 (and dependent claims 2-9, 12-15, 17, 22-67, and 69-74) remain pending in this application. The Office Action issued by the Examiner has been carefully considered.

Claims 1-9, 12-15, 22-67, 69-74 and 76 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al. (hereinafter, "Jones", U.S. Patent No. 6,430,164) in view of Grabelsky et al. (hereinafter, "Grabelsky", U.S. Patent No. 6,678,250).

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites that "the gateway node comprises at least one interface port, at least one real-time interface processor (RTIP), and at least one application processor, wherein the at least one RTIP performs real-time operations and the at least one application processor performs high level processing functions." The Examiner has agreed that Jones does not disclose the foregoing recitation.

The Examiner has stated that, given the teaching of Grabelsky, it would have been obvious to modify Jones by including a real-time control processor and an application processor. However, the portions of Grabelsky cited by the Examiner do not even disclose the use of a real-time control processor and an application processor. Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to present a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 1.

More specifically, Grabelsky is directed to providing a system capable of monitoring the quality of individual voice, video and other real-time connections, and also to monitor and evaluate the overall performance of packet-based networks (col. 1, lines 10-13). Grabelsky discusses the use of real-time transport protocol (RTP) for carrying real-time data (col. 4, lines 41-43) in this regard. Grabelsky further discusses that RTP includes a control protocol, RTCP, which allows session members to monitor and exchange information related to network performance (col. 5, lines 36-40).

Serial No. 09/684,490

PATENT
Docket No. 78700.010000

The Examiner has cited col. 5, lines 50-65, of Grabelsky, which discusses the use of RTCP to generate per-connection performance statistics and to collect them in databases 14 (FIG. 1). Further, Grabelsky here teaches that each gateway 20 preferably includes a database 14 to collect information generated by RTCP.

However, this cited section does not even mention the word "processor". Moreover, the Examiner has not presented any argument as to how this section teaches both a real-time interface processor and an application processor, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. When gateway 20 is mentioned, Grabelsky only describes that it includes a database 14. Clearly, the Examiner has not presented a prima facie case as to how Grabelsky teaches or suggests a real-time interface processor and an application processor.

The Examiner additionally has cited col. 12, lines 46-63, of Grabelsky, which discusses the generation of the RTCP packet and its transmission externally to other gateways, and its being sent to an internal monitoring process on the generating gateway. Again, however, the Examiner has not demonstrated with any argument how the discussion here in Grabelsky of a computing process (e.g., an internal monitoring process) discloses a gateway node comprising a real-time interface processor (RTIP) and an application processor. Also, the Examiner has not made clear how the transmission of an RTCP packet to other gateways teaches such processors on a gateway node. Therefore, Applicant believes that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 1.

Applicant's other independent claim 76 recites that "the means for coupling includes at least one interface means, at least one first processing means for performing real-time processing operations and at least one second processing means for performing high level processing operations." The Examiner has agreed that Jones does not disclose the foregoing recitation.

The Examiner has cited the teachings of the same sections of Grabelsky as were cited for claim 1 above. Further, the Examiner has stated that it would be obvious to modify Jones by including a real-time control processor and an application processor. Yet, as was discussed above, the Examiner has not made at all clear how the cited sections of Grabelsky teach these

Serial No. 09/684,490

PATENT
Docket No. 78700.010000

processors. Accordingly, Applicant believes that the Examiner has not made a prima facie case of obviousness for independent claim 76.

Applicant's other claims 2-9, 12-15, 17, 22-67, and 69-74 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the allowance of all pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Applicant believes that the Examiner's other arguments not discussed above are moot in light of the above arguments, but reserves the later right to address these arguments. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce T. Neel
Reg. No. 37,406

Date: May 9, 2006

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (602) 445-8339
Fax: (602) 445-8100
E-mail: neelb@gtlaw.com